

**Minutes of:** CALIFORNIA STATE ATHLETIC COMMISSION  
**Meeting Specifics:** Regular Commission Meeting  
May 15, 2003 – 10:00 a.m.  
Irvine City Hall  
One Civic Center Plaza  
Irvine, CA

**1. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN**

Commissioners Present: Van Gordon Sauter, Chairman  
Armando Vergara  
Christopher Mears

Commissioner Absent: Al Ducheny  
Sanford Michelman, Vice-Chairman  
John Frierson

Staff Present: Rob Lynch, Executive Officer  
Dean Lohuis, Chief Athletic Inspector  
Earl Plowman, Deputy Attorney General  
Anita Scuri, DCA Legal Counsel  
Jessica Finch, Recording Secretary

Due to the fact that the Commission did not have a quorum, this meeting is considered a sub-committee meeting of the Commission. Recommendations made by this sub-committee will be heard at the next regular Commission meeting.

(The items were heard in the following order: 1-2-3-4-6-12-18-15.3.2-15.3-5)

**2. APPROVAL OF MARCH 26, 2003 COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

**Action:** Motion by Chairman Sauter and seconded by Commissioner Mears to recommend that the Commission approve March 26, 2002 meeting minutes as submitted.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**3. SUMMARY OF CHAIRMAN ACTIVITIES SINCE LAST MEETING**

Chairman Sauter stated that he did not have any activities to report.

**4. SUMMARY OF EXECUTIVE OFFICER ACTIVITIES SINCE LAST MEETING**

Mr. Lynch stated that today (May 15, 2003) is the day that the May Revise is released (Governor's revised budget) based upon last month's revenues, etc. He explained that all state agencies including the California State Athletic Commission were required to present a 10% personnel reduction plan. He stated that whether or not the reduction is implemented may be

contingent upon whether or not the rank and file employees agree to the concessions that the Governor is requesting. He further explained that none of the departments are immune and after speaking with an Assistant Attorney General he was informed that the Attorney General's Office 10% reduction would include stoppage of services to the Athletic Commission and a layoff of 48 attorneys.

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that Assembly Bill 1074 (dealing with MRI examinations) and Assembly Bill 1458 (attraction of high profile events) were heard March 14, 2003 at the Assembly Appropriations Committee and went through with unanimous votes.

Mr. Lynch then stated that the Commission has been extremely busy of late, explaining that most states have 10 to 15 fights per year but in California we have 18 just in the month of May. He further commended Dean and staff for their commitment and tenacity.

Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Lynch to elaborate on Assembly bill 1074. Mr. Lynch replied that this bill was introduced by Assembly Member Chavez and originally required that boxers who were rendered unconscious have an immediate MRI at the venue. He explained that the bill had been amended to state that the boxer would be required to have an MRI examination within 24 hours and that a written report by a neurologist or neurosurgeon be submitted to the Commission before the boxer would be allowed to compete again.

Mr. Lynch stated that at the last Commission meeting, the Commission voted to oppose this bill. He further stated that he did a poll of the promoters and the consensus of the promoters was an opposition also. Mr. Lynch explained that last year there were 204 knockouts in the State of California. He added that he had informed the Appropriation Committee of the cost of the MRI examination (\$500-\$1000 per examination). He added that he had also stated to the Appropriations Committee that this bill would force most of the promoters to move their events to Sovereign land where this law may not be enforced. He further added that other states may not recognize the California MRI requirement suspension if their state does not require the examination. Mr. Lynch explained that the Appropriations Committee does not seem to understand the Commission's position and that there is a feeling among the Committee that this is a health and safety issue.

Commissioner Mears then asked if a letter of opposition had been sent to Assembly Member Chavez. Mr. Lynch that it had been sent. Commissioner Mears then asked if the promoter's insurance would cover this expense. Mr. Lynch replied that he had spoken with the three major insurance carriers and that this expense would not be covered. Commissioner Mears suggested that a meeting be held with Assembly Member Chavez and Dr. Paul Wallace to discuss the health and safety aspect of this bill.

Commissioner Mears then asked the members and the audience if there was anyone in attendance with any views that they wish to heard either in support or opposition of this proposed bill.

Mr. Chuck Hasset, a licensed judge, stated that there are two classifications currently for a knockout. One being a technical knockout when a boxer is physically unable to continue due to

an injury and knockout in which the referee stops the contest because he feels that one of the boxers should not continue and the boxer may or may not be “counted out”. He explained that in the event that this bill passes that perhaps the definition of a knockout may have to be revised.

Chairman Sauter then suggested that the meeting that Commissioner Mears had suggested earlier takes place and invite Assembly Member Chavez to an event in the near future. He further suggested that the meeting be held prior to his attendance at an event so that the Commission’s position could be elaborated on by a ringside physician and a Commissioner along with staff to explain that this would be an unnecessary hardship placed upon the promoters and boxers and that this may drive the promoters to promote their events on Sovereign land.

Mr. Earl Plowman stated that if this bill would pass it may be enforceable on Sovereign land due the original McCain law which states that unless a Native American tribe decides to regulate boxing on their lands that their standards cannot be any less than the State Commission’s are. He further explained that it would be a two step policy, if the Commission were to continue to be used on the Native American land then the Commission would be obliged to use this law under the McCain law; if the Native American tribes formed their own commissions they could evade this unless the Association of Boxing Commissions took action. Mr. Lynch stated that he agreed with Mr. Plowman. Chairman Sauter then asked if this bill were to pass, if it would encourage the Native American tribes to move towards their own commission. Mr. Plowman stated that it was his belief that it would.

Commissioner Mears stated that this legislation sounds like a good thing to do to the average legislator and that it needed to be discussed with medical personnel to inform Assembly Member Chavez that this would not be good medicine and nor would it protect the health and safety of the boxers.

Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Lynch to coordinate a meeting with the Assembly Member with Dr. Wallace, at least one Commissioner, staff and at least one promoter.

Mr. Martin Denkin, a licensed referee, explained that the wording in the bill states “rendered unconscious” and this may be difficult to define. He further added that passage of this bill may invite promoters to persuade the referees to stop fights before a “knockout” so that this expense could be avoided. He added that this situation would then deprive the consumer and contestants of a fight of consequence. Mr. Plowman stated that from a legal standpoint that being “counted out” would be included under this bill.

## **5. 2003 MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS - ACTION**

**Action:** Chairman Sauter recommended that the next regular meeting be held on June 13, 2003 in Los Angeles and the following be held August 14 ,2003 at a venue to be announced.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**6. LICENSE APPROVALS – NEW APPLICATIONS – SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS - ACTION**

**6.1 Robert and Sherry Beene – dba RSB Entertainment Group – Amateur Martial Arts Promoter – Original**

Mr. and Mrs. Beene were not in attendance. Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that Robert and Sherry Beene are applying for an original 2003 amateur martial arts promoter license. RSB Entertainment Group met all of the licensing requirements and was issued a temporary promoter license February 19, 2003. Their first event was held on March 22, 2003 at the Santa Maria Fairgrounds. The show appeared not to be a financial success and there were only four amateur bouts on the card. Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that the check written to the Commission had “bounced”.

Mr. Lynch stated that staff recommends that RSB Entertainment Group be fined the sum of \$2,500 and that the bond will be attached for the amount owed. Ms. Scuri stated that a more thorough financial statement be submitted should this promoter wish to reapply.

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Mears and seconded by Commissioner Vergara to recommend to the Commission to deny the temporary license of RSB Entertainment Group and to impose a fine in the amount of \$2,500 and to require the promoter to submit a comprehensive financial statement should the promoter reapply.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**6.2 Thell Torrence and Greg Gulli – dba Platinum Promotions – Professional Boxing Promoter – Original**

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that Messrs. Torrence and Gulli are applying for an original 2003 professional boxing promoter license. Platinum Promotions met all of the licensing requirements and were issued a temporary professional boxing promoter license on April 8, 2003. Their first event was held on May 2, 2003 at the Bicycle Club Casino in Bell Gardens. This event was well organized and well attended even though the main event fell out due to a boxer’s weight problem. Staff experienced no unusual problems at this event and recommends that Platinum Promotions be granted a 2003 professional boxing promoter license.

Mr. Earl Plowman stated that the application was on a 2002 form and asked Mr. Lynch if the 2003 were different in any way other than the year. Mr. Lynch replied that there were no differences.

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Mears and seconded by Commissioner Vergara to recommend to the Commission to grant Platinum Promotions a permanent 2003 professional boxing license.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**6.3 Kathryn Duva – dba Main Events – Professional Boxing Promoter - Original**

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that he had approved Ms. Duva's request to have Mr. Don Chargin, a well-known promoter in good standing with the Commission, be allowed to represent her in this meeting.

Mr. Lynch explained that Main Events is applying for an original 2003 professional boxing promoter license. Main Events met all of the licensing requirements and were issued a temporary promoter license on February 5, 2003. Their first event was a co-promotion with California licensed promoter Ringside Ticket held on May 10 at the Pechanga Entertainment Casino in Temecula. This event was televised on NBC. Mr. Lynch stated that he had viewed the event on television and felt that the bouts were exceptionally matched.

Mr. Chargin stated that he has been associated with the Duva family for many years and that the next scheduled event for Main Events will be in July at the Olympic Auditorium featuring Fernando Vargas. He further stated that he personally vouched for Main Events and recommended their approval. Chairman Sauter stated that the Duva family is widely recognized as a positive force in boxing.

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Mears and seconded by Commissioner Vergara to recommend to the Commission approval of Main Events for a permanent professional boxing license.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**7. PROMOTER EVENT CHECKLIST – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was not heard.

**8. LENGTH OF SUSPENSIONS – CALIFORNIA VS. OTHER STATES – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was not heard.

**9. CALCULATION OF ACTUAL EVENT REVENUES – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was not heard.

**10. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was heard in conjunction with Item 4.

**11. ADMINISTRATION OF EVENTS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was not heard.

**12. REFEREE EVALUATIONS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

Chairman Sauter stated that Commission Rule 376 states in part "...it shall be the duty of the assigned commission representative to grade each boxing referee's performance for each contest presided over by the referee. The grade shall either be satisfactory or unsatisfactory...". The Commission previously utilized the evaluation services of Mr. Larry Rozadilla who was a former world class referee. Even as skilled as Mr. Rozadilla was, he could not evaluate all of the officials all of the time including those in Northern California. With the passing of Mr. Rozadilla the Commission is left with no evaluator whatsoever.

The grading of a referee's performance is crucial to the health and safety of the fights as an inept official could allow unnecessary punishment to be taken by a boxer. The evaluation is also a critical part of the scheme of things when the Commission is considering the removal of a referee's license.

The Commission's Officials' Committee has met on several occasions to develop options for the evaluation of referees. This committee is comprised of Chairman Sauter, Commissioner Frierson, Mr. Lynch and Deputy Attorney General Earl Plowman. The committee has received input from numerous currently licensed officials.

The Committee would like to present the three most viable options to begin the evaluation process:

#### Option 1

Appoint a new evaluator who is highly regarded professional who can spend the time necessary to insure each licensed referee is observed frequently enough to insure a comprehensive evaluation. This individual will also provide, when called for, appropriate remedial action.

#### Option 2

Train our intermittent inspectors to perform the evaluation process, insuring that they apply and abide by a common standard for evaluations. Each referee must be evaluated frequently enough to insure the appraisal is equitable. Remedial assistance, where necessary, would be assigned by the Executive Officer.

#### Option 3

The Masters Program – A limited number of esteemed retired referees, selected by the Executive Officer and the Commissioners, and reporting to the Executive Officer, provides the evaluation process. And, when necessary, any remedial efforts. They would be assigned by the Executive Officer and report to that office. The evaluation standards fall into these established categories: knowledge of the rules; ring mechanics; decisiveness; and physical condition. The standards, to be reviewed and published, must be as transparent as possible. These evaluators will continue to work as judges. However, they will not simultaneously evaluate a referee while judging a fight. The Executive Officer will assign them to a range and quality of fights to insure an appropriate compensation base.

Chairman Sauter then asked the Commission to select an option that would best suit the sport. He explained that the financial aspect of the options would be discussed at a later date. He then opened the discussion to the audience.

Mr. Lohuis informed the Commission that he has been absent for much of the discussions on this matter due to illness but has kept abreast by reading the notes and minutes that have been kept. He explained that there had previously been comments made that connected the evaluation process and the assignment process together and he wanted to go on record that there is no such connection and they are completely different. He further stated that the evaluations are subjective and the assignments are objective. Mr. Lohuis feels that at present the Southern California referees are being evaluated due to the fact that he is in attendance himself at many of the events and if not, Mr. Joe Borrelli is in attendance. He further stated that he does comment to the referees at every fight regarding their performance and feels he has been doing this in a positive manner.

Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Lohuis of the three options given, which he preferred to see in place. Mr. Lohuis replied that a version of Option 2 could be done. He suggested that a additional line be placed on the Supervisors Report for the inspector to comment on the referee's performance. He explained that it was policy in the past that the referee would comment on this report regarding the bout and the ringside inspector would also comment (good job/bad job/needs improvement). He further explained that this worked prior to installing Mr. Rozadilla as an evaluator. He added that the Officials Association was very strong at that time and ongoing training by that Association was also very strong. He stated that the Officials Association is not what it was before.

Mr. Roy Englebrecht, Golden Boy Promotions, stated that the quality of officiating is paramount in the success of any event. He stated that his concern is that the promoter has no current input on the evaluation of the officials. He informed the Commission that he was an official in major league sports and that every coach of each team as well as the evaluator/peers did his evaluation. He suggested that the same form used by the evaluator be given to the promoter to fill out and submit. He further suggested that a rating system be implemented along with an evaluation process. Chairman Sauter replied that when he has observed Mr. Englebrecht at an event, that Mr. Englebrecht is extremely busy and it would seem impossible for him to perform an evaluation during his shows. Mr. Englebrecht replied that if this was a possibility then he would make the evaluation a priority. Commissioner Mears stated that he believes that although there may be a few promoters that are interested in this, there are many that may not. Mr. Englebrecht stated that the promoters have been facing steady increased costs in conjunction with promoting and he has a concern and is not in favor of the promoter being charged with an additional cost of another official unless the promoter could have some feedback. Mr. Plowman stated that if input from the promoters is acceptable, then that information should be given to the ringside inspector and put in writing. He explained that on the Commission's behalf he has looked into allegations made by the promoters at an event but when the issue was addresses later, the promoter would refuse to put anything in writing or retracted what he or she had originally stated. He concluded that it was his experience that promoter input has not been beneficial in the overall regulating of the officials conducting the bouts.

Mr. Don Chargin stated that it was his belief that an evaluator is needed but is unsure whether or not he personally would want the additional task of evaluating each referee. He concurred with Mr. Englebrecht as to his concern that the promoter would be burdened with the cost of having the evaluator present. He added that when he has promoted on Native American land, that he as a promoter has saved a considerable amount of money. He suggested that Option 2 might be the more equitable.

Mr. Martin Denkin stated that in previous discussions the cost of the evaluators was not intended to be passed on to the promoters and other areas are being considered. He stated that no matter what system is implemented that the officials are aware that they are accountable and will abide by whichever system the Commission deems appropriate. He did have a concern to the promoters having input and did not feel that this is appropriate. He informed the Commission that he believes that a rating system needed to be implemented and made available. Commissioner Mears then asked Mr. Denkin how many evaluators would the Masters Program need in order to be efficient. Mr. Denkin replied that he believes it should be comprised of six members; four in Southern California and two in Northern California. He believes that this would give equitable coverage. He elaborated that by having more than one evaluator it would give more credibility to the evaluation by having more than one person concur with an opinion or to disparage the opinion of an evaluator if it is not the same as the others. Mr. Denkin further suggested that all bouts be filmed and distributed to the referee for review.

Mr. Chuck Hassett who has been involved with this process from the beginning stated that many years ago there was a form utilized that was an event report. He explained that although Mr. Lohuis stated that he thought that this worked, Mr. Hassett disagreed and stated that it was not effective and that is why the evaluation form and Mr. Rozadilla came into use. He added that many of the officials felt that the evaluation and assignment program co-mingled in that if the official frequently stated that the bouts were a mismatch, then the official was not assigned. He further explained that when a problem with an official arose, there was no history of that official's performance to back the Commission's decision to no longer use that official. It was his belief that consistent performance evaluation and rating needed to be made so that each official would know where they stood and how to improve their perspective ratings. He suggested that at each Commission meeting a report would be done to the Commission on the officials and how they were doing. He stated that although he has tremendous respect for Mr. Englebrecht, he does not believe the promoter should be involved with the evaluation process at all. Mr. Hassett stated that Option 3 is the best choice with a head of the Masters Program to report to the Executive Officer to ensure continuity. He explained that having an inspector evaluate an official is not acceptable to any of the officials and would not be agreeable. Chairman Sauter then asked if he understood him to say that it would be a combination of Option 1 and Option 3. Mr. Hassett stated that yes that is what he was referring to and to add training of the officials. Mr. Lohuis stated that a director of officials must be implemented to have continuity.

Chairman Sauter then asked if every referee needed to be evaluated for every bout. Mr. Hassett stated that the regulation currently states that indeed every referee for every bout. Ms. Scuri stated that if the Commission had the desire, the regulation could be changed. Chairman Sauter then asked if 100% coverage was indeed needed. Mr. Hassett stated that it depended on the



official. He explained that some borderline officials needed to be evaluated every time and others who do not need that supervision. He added that by evaluating every time that the removal of a license could be more effectively implemented also. Mr. Denkin stated that he agreed with Mr. Hassett. Mr. Hassett added that unlike other professional sports, when a referee walks into the ring he has life or death responsibilities that no other official in other sports has.

Mr. Lohuis stated that there are currently marginal officials (below standard) working and he believes for the health and safety of the boxer at this time that an immediate implementation needs to be made. Commissioner Mears then asked if there was a mechanism in place that those officials could be currently removed. Mr. Hassett states that there is a mechanism in the evaluation of “needs improvement” and then removal could be made to be placed in “training” but this is not being done at present.

Chairman Sauter stated that to successfully operate, the Commission must have an evaluation system, rating category system and the elimination of those individuals that cannot perform in a manner that the peer group and supervisory organization feels is mandatory.

Ms. Scuri stated that part of the operation that Chairman Sauter is seeking is already in place via Rule 377 to provide for suspension or removal of an official’s license by the Executive Officer to be further investigated by the Commission. Commissioner Mears then asked if this process has ever been used. Ms. Scuri replied that it has not been used since it was adopted.

(At this time Mr. Plowman and Ms. Scuri informed the Commission as to the history of Rule 377 and the subsections.)

A discussion of a recent situation in which an official was doing a substandard performance was made without particulars due to the fact that this is in an ongoing investigation status.

Commissioner Mears then asked if Option 1 would give thorough consistent coverage. Chairman Sauter replied that it would be superficial and would not provide consistent coverage. Chairman Sauter then asked if evaluations could fairly and thoroughly be done without covering every bout every time. Mr. Lohuis stated that he does not believe every official needs to be evaluated every time. Ms. Scuri stated that in order to avoid selective enforcement the regulation should be changed to provide a specified number of bouts to be evaluated and provides for some discretion for the Commission. Mr. Lynch stated that it was his belief with as often as our official’s work, not every bout needed to be covered for every official. Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Lynch if he could arrive at a percentage rate of coverage that would be adequate. Mr. Lynch replied that he could.

Commissioner Mears then asked Ms. Scuri if an evaluation rule could be crafted that would vest in someone the discretion as to which bouts to evaluate but not less than a certain percentage of all referees. Ms. Scuri stated that it could be crafted.

Mr. Hassett stated that he believed that it was not necessary to evaluate the referee every bout. He explained that if a rating system were to be implemented then the referee would have to be at a certain level with a minimum number of evaluations (i.e. “C” officials 100% of the time, “B”

officials 50% of the time, “A” officials 25% of the time). He further explained that on any given card the officials will vary from “A, B” or “C”. Mr. Hassett added that the Chairman of the Officials Committee and staff should meet quarterly to discuss the evaluations.

Commissioner Mears then informed the Commission that he endorses Option 3, which seems to have the most equitable solution. Chairman Sauter agreed and added that a director of this Master Program be developed also. Commissioner Vergara agreed with Chairman Sauter and added that this director should present reports to the Commission. Chairman Sauter informed the Commission that he would like to move forward with Option 3 and have further discussions as to how to achieve this process and implement this system. Mr. Plowman suggested that when discussion of this system is made that every referee be evaluated for every bout for a year in order to give the Commission a baseline and or criteria to make a judgement on. He added that the evaluation form should be revised and that the evaluator should rank the official on the particular performance as an “A, B” or “C” official. He explained that it would establish a trend. Chairman Sauter then asked who would report to whom. Mr. Plowman explained that administratively all reports are made to the Executive Officer, therefore the director of this Masters Program should report to the Executive Officer. Mr. Denkin stated that the director should report to the Chief Athletic Inspector and then the Chief to the Executive Officer. Mr. Plowman replied that because ultimately the Executive Officer is responsible, then the director must report to the Executive Officer.

Chairman Sauter then suggested that the group that had previously met to discuss this issue, meet again to discuss the particulars.

**13. COMMISSION RULES 217 & 218 – WRITTEN EXAMINATION AS  
CONDITION OF LICENSURE – MATCHMAKER / MANAGER / SECOND /  
TIMEKEEPER – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was not heard.

**14. PROMOTER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was not heard.

**15. COMMITTEE REPORTS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

**15.1 Arbitration Committee Report**

This item was not heard.

**15.2 Pension Plan Review Committee Report**

This item was not heard.

**15.3 Medical and Safety Standards Advisory Committee Report**

- Dr. Paul Wallace stated that per Rule 292 regarding sanitation, he would like the Commission to advise the Referees and cornerman of the importance of the use of gloves. He further stated that he would like the Commission to send a memo to all Referees with a strong recommendation that gloves be worn for every event. Commissioner Mears

asked Dr. Wallace if he was aware of any cases in which there has been transmission of a blood borne disease in any of these ways. Dr. Wallace stated there had been none that he was aware of in boxing but it is very controversial. Dr. Wallace stated that he does not believe it needs to be a regulation but strongly suggests that the Commission send a recommendation. Mr. Lynch stated that this issue had been presented before and the argument regarding cornermen wearing gloves was that the cornermen pick-up or touch many items around the ring (i.e. stool, ropes, mouthpiece, bloody towels, etc.). Dr. Wallace stated that at the least the referee should wear them and the inspectors could suggest that the cornermen wear them on a consistent basis.

Mr. Denkin stated that for the record he is opposed to wearing gloves.

Chairman Sauter stated that it would not only be for health and safety awareness but also for appearance sake for the referee to wear gloves. He then asked Mr. Lynch to send out a recommendation that all referees wear gloves.

- Dr. Wallace stated that a suggestion has been made that a container be provided in each corner to put blood contaminated materials. He stated that in USA Boxing a bag is provided in each corner for this purpose. Therefore, he suggests that a bag be provided in each corner and a receptacle in each dressing room for contaminated materials.

Dr. Wallace then stated that at a current event there was a particular boxer whose hair was impairing the fighter's vision. He suggested that if the inspector who is working the backroom observes the fighter's hair is past the eyebrows, that the boxer be told to either cut the hair or rubber band the hair back away from the face. Ms. Scuri noted that Rule 305 addresses this issue and may be helpful to the inspector working to enforce the contestants' appearance. Chairman Sauter then instructed Mr. Lynch to release a memo to the inspectors and ringside physicians regarding Rule 305.

- Dr. Wallace then addressed an issue regarding boxing gloves. He stated that the Business and Professions Code 18723 it states that "... the thumb is not detached from the glove in such a manner that injury could result...". He explained that the problem is that there is no standard or measurement for the detachment. He informed the Commission that at a recent event the detachment was approximately 1 inch, which Dr. Wallace felt, could result in an injury. Mr. Lynch asked what type of glove it was and Dr. Wallace replied that he would have to check his notes and is unsure at this time. Mr. Lynch stated that he would write a memo to the inspectors and the manufacturer of the specific glove Dr. Wallace is referring to regarding the boxing gloves and to double check the detachment.
- Dr. Wallace then addressed the Health Information Privacy Protection Act (HIPPA) issue. He asked the Commission if a waiver of some type had been drafted regarding the applicant's medical information. Ms. Scuri advised him that the Department of Consumer Affairs is currently investigating this issue and will address it at a later date. Mr. Plowman added that an opinion could not be made at this time. Ms. Scuri added that a line of consent could be added onto the application.

- Dr. Wallace then informed the Commission that there have been problems with the current wave of amateur boxing events and asked for clarity on the rules of amateur boxing. Specifically he questioned the length of training of an amateur boxer and how many times an amateur boxer may fight in one day. He stated that it has been difficult to find a physician willing to work these events in which there may be up to 22 bouts in one night and the physician is only being paid \$200. He stated that although it was his impression that the boxers may fight once on the first night and no more than twice on the second night, he has found that some are fighting three times on the second night. Mr. Lynch replied that originally when Mr. Art Dore was approved for amateur boxing, he understood the agreement was one bout on the first night and no more than three on the second night taking into consideration Dr. Wallace's and Mr. Lohuis's professional opinion. Dr. Wallace explained that when he endorsed the "up to three times" what he meant was no more than three bouts for the duration of the events (both days combined).

Dr. Wallace further explained that these contestants are poorly trained if at all. Mr. Lynch responded stated that each applicant is signing the application, which does ask how long the applicant has been training. Dr. Wallace stated that he has grave concern regarding the honesty of the applicants in that there is no verification. He further stated that there is a serious medical concern for these participants. Mr. Plowman suggested that he discuss these issues with the other physicians that are working these events to make a report to the Commission. He further informed the Commission that if a licensed amateur promoter is violating the rules and regulation of the Commission, then the Commission should be aware of the problems. Mr. Denkin stated that it was his recollection that the Commission approved one fight the first night and no more than two the second night. He added that he has heard from the officials that have worked these type of events and that he has heard that the participants are not only out of shape but also at times uncontrollable.

Dr. Wallace then stated that these problems have not been with Mr. Dore's promotion but with the others that have suddenly appeared.

Chairman Sauter stated that he does have concern as to whether or not these events are following the guidelines of the Commission and that the health and safety of the participants are being considered. Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Lynch to poll the inspectors be done that have worked these events and report back to the Commission so that the Commission has a more thorough understanding of how these events are taking place. Ms. Scuri stated that now that the Commission has some experience regarding these events she agreed that it would be beneficial to the Commission to have a report of some kind. Chairman Sauter then suggested that prior to the next amateur boxing event that a memo be given to the inspectors and promoters regarding the rules and regulations of amateur boxing and promoting that must be followed. Commissioner Mears then suggested that this item be placed on the next agenda and invite all of the amateur boxing promoters to discuss the misgivings that have arisen.

- Dr. Wallace informed the Commission that at a recent event a physician sutured a boxer even though the physician did not feel comfortable in doing so. He stated that it was his

understanding that sutures were not a responsibility or duty of the ringside physician. He elaborated that if a physician does decide to suture a boxer, that it be done after the last bout has ended so that the ringside physician can concentrate on the bout at hand. He stated that it is not an emergency nor is there an urgency for the sutures to be done immediately. He further explained that there have been complaints by ringside physicians that they have been pressured by staff and the promoters to “stitch the guy up” or else “you won’t work my fights anymore”. Chairman Sauter stated that a statement of that nature should never be done. Mr. Plowman stated that if a physician is not comfortable suturing a boxer that it should not be done. He added that if it is urgent that the boxer receives medical care, the boxer should be transported to the nearest emergency room. Chairman Sauter then instructed Mr. Lynch to discuss this matter with staff.

- Dr. Wallace then asked for clarity on additional testing of an applicant. He asked specifically asked if the rule pertaining to the Commission paying 50% of the cost of the examination applied to an applicant or a licensee. Mr. Lynch stated that it would apply to current licensees only. Ms. Scuri stated that Business and Professions Code 18710 provides that it would only apply to a licensee. Dr. Wallace then asked if the additional testing is required, is it required only if the boxer fights again in California or if the fighter competes again anywhere. For instance, if a boxer is placed on a suspension by California requiring additional testing and the boxer is going to fight in a jurisdiction that does not require the additional tests, the jurisdiction has been asking that the fighter be taken off of suspension.
- Dr. Wallace then addressed Business and Professions Code 18731 and Regulation 288 specifically pertaining to clinics. Chairman Sauter then asked if he was particularly concerned about those physicians he feels are inadequate to work alone without having attended these mandated clinics. Chairman Sauter then stated that he would like to add this to the next agenda meeting.

#### 15.3.1 Ringside Physician Pay

This item was not heard.

#### 15.3.2 Amateur Martial Arts Fighters – Blood tests

Dr. Wallace requested that the Commission place the issue of amateur martial arts fighters regarding blood tests vs. headgear on the next agenda. He stated that it his medical opinion and the recommendation of the Medical Advisory Committee that if the amateur boxers are not going to be required to provide negative blood results as professionals do, then all amateurs should be required to wear headgear. He explained that if all amateurs wear headgear, the likelihood of a laceration is greatly minimized. He further explained that in amateur boxing (USA Boxing) when there is a laceration, the bout is stopped. If there is a bloody nose the bout is suspended until the corner can stop the bloody nose.

Ms. Scuri informed the Commission that in order to require the amateur fighters to provide negative blood results, legislation would have to be

drafted. She further explained that the Commission could change the headgear requirement in Rule 711. Dr. Wallace stated that it is his position that all amateurs be required to wear headgear until legislation could be drafted to require negative blood results.

**15.4 Officials Committee Report**

This item was not heard.

**15.5 Amateur Boxing Committee Report**

This item was not heard.

**16. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

Recommendations to the Commission from this sub-committee meeting

Evaluations

Rule 711

Amateur Boxing Promotions

Ringside Physician clinics

All items not covered in this meeting

**17. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS**

There were no comments or recommendations.

**18. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Mr. Eddie Greenwood explained to the Commission that he had previously applied as a professional promoter and will be re-applying as an amateur promoter. Ms. Scuri informed him that he must submit an original application with current information if he would like to apply for 2003.

Mr. Gregory Fajardo, LA Boxing, then asked the Commission how he could receive information on currently licensed boxers and current suspensions. Chairman Sauter referred him to speak with Ms. Jessica Finch after the meeting and that staff at the Sacramento office could provide him with that information.

\*\*\*

The meeting was then adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

The draft minutes were prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
JESSICA FINCH

May 22, 2003  
DATE

The final minutes were prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
JESSICA FINCH

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE